

### REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed on May 30, 2003, the Examiner issued a renewed restriction requirement. While the Examiner agreed that the previously stated reasons for the restriction requirement were insufficient and improper, the Examiner also provided a new reason for the restriction requirement and required affirmation of the previous provisional election. The Examiner accepted the proposed substitute sheet of drawings. Finally, the Examiner rejected claims 1-10 and 12-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Lasch et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,082,715) in view of Morris et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,673,148) and rejected claim 11 as unpatentable over Lasch et al. and Morris et al. in further view of Walter (U.S. Pat. No. 5,660,768). By this amendment, claim 1 has been amended. Claims 1-15 are currently under consideration.

The undersigned attorney wishes to thank Examiner Vo for the courtesies extended during the telephone interview of June 17, 2003. During that interview, proposed amendments to claims 1 and 16 were discussed. The Examiner indicated that the pending claims would be allowable if amended as proposed.

In the Office Action, the Examiner approved the proposed drawing correction presented in the Amendment filed on March 3, 2003. Accordingly, an amended formal drawing for Fig. 4 is presented herein.

Claim 1 has been amended to provide that the reflective material layer is in direct contact with the substrate. As recognized by the Examiner during the interview of June 17, 2003, claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over Lasch et al. and Morris et al. Likewise, the Applicant maintains that claims 2-15, which directly or indirectly depend from claim 1 and incorporate all of the limitations of claim 1, also patentably distinguish over the cited prior art. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The previous provisional election of the claims of group I (claims 1-15), with traverse, is hereby affirmed. In light of the Examiner's indication that claims 1-15 would be allowable if amended as previously proposed, the Applicant also requests rejoinder of the claims of group II (claims 16-25).

Application No.: 09/824,612  
Amendment dated: July 9, 2003  
Reply to Office Action of May 30, 2003

In light of the foregoing amendments and arguments presented herein, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application, withdrawal of the restriction requirement, and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). A formal Notice of Allowance of claims 1-25 is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner care to discuss any of the foregoing in greater detail, or to discuss amendment of the non-elected claims, the undersigned attorney would welcome a telephone call.

No fees are believed to be due at this time. Nonetheless, in the event that a fee required for the filing of this document is insufficient, the undersigned attorney hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge payment of any fees associated with this communication, or to credit any overpayment to deposit account number 18-0987.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Donald J. Bobak, Reg. No. 27,182  
John J. Cunniff, Reg. No. 42,451  
Renner, Kenner, Greive, Bobak, Taylor & Weber  
First National Tower - Fourth Floor  
Akron, Ohio 44308-1456  
Telephone: (330) 376-1242  
Facsimile: (330) 376-9646  
E-mail: [jjcunniff@rennerkenner.com](mailto:jjcunniff@rennerkenner.com)

Attorney for Applicant

Dated: July 9, 2003  
Attachment - replacement drawing sheet